

**Fermi Research Alliance, LLC
and the
Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory
Source Evaluation Board
One-on-One Exchange
May 23, 2006**

One-on-One Meeting Summary

Pursuant to Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15.201, a One-on-One meeting was held on May 23, 2006 with Fermi Research Alliance, LLC (FRA) relating to the future management and operation of the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL). The purpose of the One-on-One meetings is to extend to potential offerors the opportunity to present issues and/or concerns, regarding the draft RFP, to the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in an interactive setting so that DOE has the benefit of fully understanding the concerns of the marketplace before finalizing the RFP. The themes and comments received as a result of the meeting with FRA are summarized below. DOE appreciates the efforts of all individuals who participated in the One-on-One meeting. All comments and issues raised during the meeting have been taken under advisement by the SEB.

.....

FRA Topic I – Constrained Budget Scenerio:

Question: L.3(b) Science Strategy under a constrained budget scenario...
In the reduced budget scenario, what is the meaning of “thereafter?” 4 years? 19 years? Does the phrase “DOE funding in year 2” include all Fermilab funding from DOE or is the funding for the ILC Construction outside this scenario?

Response: The constrained budget scenario is a hypothetical situation. The budget cut is in the second year and the budget is assumed to be flat for the remaining years of the contract. Assume annual escalation equivalent to inflation. Other budget assumptions are as contained in L.3(b).

This scenario should be based on the assumption that DOE HEP program will experience an equivalent 10% reduction across the DOE complex. We anticipate that the final RFP will reflect this clarification.

The decision regarding the impact of the constrained budget and its impact on the ILC is up to the Offeror, but the assumptions should be documented in the proposal.

Question: What are the assumptions?

Response: Consistent with the response above, Offerors should determine what assumptions are appropriate. Offerors should state the assumptions on which their response is based. You are allowed to submit multiple scenarios. Offerors are reminded that these scenarios are included in the 250 page limit.

FRA Topic II – Offeror’s Involvement and Resources:

Question: L.8 Offeror’s Involvement and Resources...
In addition to the request in Section L.8, public comments have been made by Department of Energy officials that Management and Operating contractors are expected to “add value” to the activity for which they have contractual responsibility. Could you please share with us the meaning of “value added” in this context and any criteria that the Department may use to judge the benefit of such value added? Also, examples of value added would be helpful.

Response: Examples of value added are resources, expertise, oversight and any other benefits the Offeror will provide to the laboratory beyond the items that the Offeror will seek reimbursement (those resources for which DOE is not paying).

FRA Topic III – International Linear Collider (ILC):

Question: C.4(b)(2) ILC...
We are committed to the capture of the ILC in the U.S. but much of this is out of our control. What is DOE’s view of the appropriate role for a contractor in the international science community in this critical effort?

Response: We would expect to see the Offerors overall plan including how it would gain the support of the international community for citing such a project at Fermilab. The ILC should be addressed under the science strategy and science approach sections. We anticipate that further clarification of the scope of Contractor’s involvement will be provided in the final RFP Statement of Work.

FRA Topic IV – Other Key Personnel:

Question: L.5(b) Other Key Personnel...
A question was raised regarding the requirement for the Offeror to propose a key person with direct day to day responsibility for ES&H, financial management, facilities management, and legal counsel.

Response: It is up to Offerors to define its organization.

FRA Topic V – Home Office Expense:

Question: L.9(c); H.4.II(b) Performance Fee...
Can you provide guidance now on which home office expenses will be considered allowable costs?

Response: The Department wants to limit the need for Home Office Expenses. Home Office Expenses must be in compliance with AL 2005-11 and DEAR 970.3102-3-70 and must demonstrate the benefit to the Department.

FRA Topic VI – Relevant Experience:

Question: L.2 (b) Relevant Experience...
In the examples section, specifically where we are asked to discuss experience in successfully managing the design and construction of R&D facilities, on schedule and within budget, may we discuss projects managed by the University of Chicago and URA for which the completion date is older than the past 3 completed fiscal years?

Response: This question should be submitted in writing, via IIPS, along with a rationale. The SEB will take your submission under advisement.

FRA Topic VII – Relevant Experience:

Statement: In citing projects under relevant experience, FRA interpreted the meaning of the \$50M threshold as applying to the M&O contract value as opposed to the individual project value.

Response: The \$50M threshold applies to the contract value.